UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/996,980	11/20/2001	Roger L. Bunting	2-5-4-3	4694

7590	09/14/2006

Docket Administrator (Room 3J-219)
Lucent Technologies Inc.
101 Crawfords Corner Road
Holmdel, NJ 07733-3030

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, TOAN D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2616	

DATE MAILED: 09/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	**Applicant(s)**
Office Action Summary	09/996,980	BUNTING ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Toan D. Nguyen	2616	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>30 June 2006</u>.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>3-5,7,10 and 14-19</u> is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>3,4,7,10,18 and 19</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☒ Claim(s) <u>5 and 14-17</u> is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>11 April 2002</u> is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

   1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/22/03</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1.   Claims 7 and 18 are objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 7 line 4, it is suggested to change "the method comprising. Providing an interface" to --- the method comprising: providing an interface ---.

In claim 18 line 7, it is suggested to change "a subscriber terminal" to --- the subscriber terminal ---.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3   This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4   Claims 3-4, 7 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Kulkarni et al. (US 5,862,481) in view of Thanh et al. (US 2004/0242186).

For claim 7, Kulkarni et al. disclose an interface (figure 5, reference GIP, col. 5

lines 23-24) operative to provide a GSM based service to a subscriber terminal (figure

5, reference ROAMING TERMINAL) in a network, the network being in accordance with

the Wireless Intelligent Network (WIN) standard developed by ANSI-41, the method

comprising providing an interface (figure 5, reference GIP) causing the GSM based

service to appear to the WIN network (figure 5, reference step 580, col. 7 lines 17-19).

However, Kulkarni et al. do not expressly disclose a Customized Application for

Mobile Enhanced Logic (CAMEL) based service, and causing the CAMEL based

service as an Application in accordance with the Open Service Access (OSA) standard,

the interface comprising an OSA interface to an OSA gateway of the WIN network; the

interface converting received OSA messages to CAMEL Appl;ication Protocol

Messages. In an analogous art, Thanh et al. disclose a Customized Application for

Mobile Enhanced Logic (CAMEL) based service, and by causing the CAMEL based

service as an Application in accordance with the Open Service Access (OSA) standard

(figure 8, page 5, paragraph [0070] lines 9-11), the interface comprising an OSA

interface (figure 8, reference OSA) to an OSA gateway of the WIN network (page 5,

paragraph [0070]); the interface converting received OSA messages to CAMEL

Application Protocol Messages (page 5, paragraph [0070]).

One skilled in the art would have recognized the CAMEL based service, and

would have applied Thanh et al.'s mapping between OSA call control API and to

CAMEL for the GSM/UMTS network in Kulkarni et al.'s GIP interworking. Therefore, it

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to

use Thanh et al.'s extended telecommunication system architecture for open service

access in Kulkarni et al.'s inter-technology roaming proxy with the motivation being to

provide application service access on multiple heterogeneous networks (page 1,

paragraph [0001] lines 2-3).

For claim 3, Kulkarni et al. disclose in which GSM (CAMEL-based subscriber

information means) is mapped to the WIN network (IS-41 means), the interface (figure

5, reference GIP) acting as a WIN home location register (HLR) (col. 6 lines 28-30).

For claims 4 and 18, Kulkarni et al. disclose inter-technology roaming proxy

comprising:

an interface (figure 9, reference IGP, col. 8 lines 66-67) to a subscriber terminal

(figure 9, reference ROAMING TERMINAL, col. 8 lines 62-65).

However, Kulkarni et al. do not expressly disclose wherein

the WIN network comprises an Open Service Access gateway (OSA GW);

the interface comprises an Open Service Access (OSA) interface to the OSA GW

of the WIN network, the interface being operative to provide a Customized Application

for Mobile Enhanced Logic(CAMEL) based service to a subscriber terminal in the WIN

network by:

causing the CAMEL based service to appear to the WIN network as an

Application in accordance with the Open Service Access (OSA) standard, and

the interface being operative to convert received Open Service Access (OSA)

messages to CAMEL Application Protocol Messages.

In an analogous art, Thanh et al. disclose wherein:

the WIN network comprises an Open Service Access gateway (OSA GW)(figure 8, reference IN/SCP, page 5, paragraph [0070]);

the interface comprises an Open Service Access (OSA) interface (figure 8, reference OSA) to the OSA GW of the WIN network, the interface being operative to provide a Customized Application for Mobile Enhanced Logic(CAMEL) based service to a subscriber terminal in the WIN network by:

causing the CAMEL based service to appear to the WIN network as an Application in accordance with the Open Service Access (OSA) standard (page 5, paragraph [0070], and

the interface being operative to convert received Open Service Access (OSA) messages to CAMEL Application Protocol Messages (page 5, paragraph [0070].

in which the interface is operative to pass the subscriber information by relating an Open Service Access (OSA) getNotification operation to a WIN registration notification (REGNOT) operation (page 5, paragraph [0077] as set forth in claim 4).

One skilled in the art would have recognized the the WIN network comprises an Open Service Access gateway (OSA GW), and would have applied Thanh et al.'s mapping between OSA call control API and to CAMEL for the GSM/UMTS network in Kulkarni et al.'s GIP interworking. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to use Thanh et al.'s extended telecommunication system architecture for open service access in Kulkarni et al.'s inter-

technology roaming proxy with the motivation being to provide application service access on multiple heterogeneous networks (page 1, paragraph [0001] lines 2-3).

5.   Claims 10 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kulkarni et al. (US 5,862,481) in view of Itzkovitz et al. (US 2003/0165135).

For claim 10, Kulkarni et al. disclose inter-technology roaming proxy, comprising: providing an interface (figure 9, reference IGP, col. 8 lines 62-63) causing the WIN based service (IS-41 means) to appear to the GSM network (col. 9 lines 39-45).

However, Kulkarni et al. do not expressly disclose a Customized Application for Mobile Enhanced Logic (CAMEL) network, and a Customized Application for Mobile Enhanced Logic (CAMEL) application (CAP), the interface comprising a WIN interface to a WIN platform of the WIN network, the interface translating CAMEL Application Protocol messages to the WIN platform. In an analogous art, Itzkovitz et al. discloses a Customized Application for Mobile Enhanced Logic (CAMEL) network, and a Customized Application for Mobile Enhanced Logic (CAMEL) application (CAP)(page 5, paragraph [0061] line 4), the interface comprising a WIN interface to a WIN platform of the WIN network, the interface translating CAMEL Application Protocol messages to the WIN platform (page 4, paragraph [0056]).

One skilled in the art would have recognized the Customized Application for Mobile Enhanced Logic (CAMEL) network, and the Customized Application for Mobile Enhanced Logic (CAMEL) application (CAP), and would have applied Itzkovitz et al.'s application adapter 64 in Kulkarni et al.'s IGP interworking. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to use

Itzkovitz et al.'s interface for intelligent network services in Kulkarni et al.'s inter-

technology roaming proxy with the motivation being to communicate with a CAMEL

server 58 (page 5, paragraph [0061] lines 5-6).

For claim 10, Kulkarni et al. disclose inter-technology roaming proxy, comprising:

an interface (figure 9, reference IGP) to a subscriber terminal (col. 8 lines 62-63);

wherein

the WIN network comprises a WIN platform (figure 9, reference IS-41, col. 8 lines

62-67);

the interface (figure 9, reference IGP) comprises a WIN interface to the WIN

platform, the interface being operative to provide a WIN based service to the subscriber

terminal (col. 8 lines 62-63).

However, Kulkarni et al. do not expressly disclose the CAMEL network by:

causing the WIN based service to a subscriber terminal in the CAMEL network to

appear to the CAMEL network as a CAMEL application, and

the interface being operative to translate received CAMEL Application Protocol

messages to the WIN platform.

In an analogous art, Itzkovitz et al. discloses the CAMEL network (page 4,

paragraph [0056]) by:

causing the WIN based service to a subscriber terminal in the CAMEL network to

appear to the CAMEL network as a CAMEL application, and

the interface being operative to translate received CAMEL Application Protocol

messages to the WIN platform (page 4, paragraph [0056]).

One skilled in the art would have recognized the CAMEL network, and would

have applied Itzkovitz et al.'s application adapter 64 in Kulkarni et al.'s IGP interworking.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention, to use Itzkovitz et al.'s interface for intelligent network services in Kulkarni et

al.'s inter-technology roaming proxy with the motivation being to communicate with a

CAMEL server 58 (page 5, paragraph [0061] lines 5-6).

Allowable Subject Matter

6.   Claims 5, and 14-17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base

claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the

limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

7.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 3-5, 7, 10, and 14-19 have been

considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

8.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Toan D. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-

3153. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:00AM-4:30PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Mr. Huy Vu can be reached on 571-272-3155. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TN
TN

HUY D. VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600